

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 were previously in the case. The Examiner has rejected these claims as being unpatentable under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Vancura U.S. Patent No. 6,033,307. The Examiner has also rejected the claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Vancura, Huard et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,743,800, Perrie U.S. Patent No. 6,173,955 and Acres U.S. Patent No. 5,836,817.

Applicants have cancelled claims 1-35 thereby rendering moot any rejections directed to these claims.

Applicant affirms that originally filed claims 19 and 34-35 have been canceled and withdrawn from consideration. Applicants assure the Examiner that this amendment does not reintroduce claims 19 and 34-35.

Applicants have added new claims 36-41. The subject matter of claims 36-41 is based on originally filed claims 1-18 and 20-33. Further support for the claims is found in the instant specification: page 5, lines 18-21; page 6, lines 4-14, page 9, lines 10-12, page 9, lines 13-17 and page 32, lines 5-21 through page 33, lines 1-5.

Applicants submit that none of the patents cited by the Examiner in the last Office Action anticipates the invention as claimed in new independent claims 36 and 41.

Applicants submit that the patents cited by the Examiner when either taken alone, or in combination, do not render obvious the networked gaming system recited in independent claims 36 and 41. The claimed invention must be taken as a whole when determining whether the claimed invention is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. (see Graham v. John Deere Co., 149 USPQ 459 (1966)). Specifically, Vancura does not disclose, suggest or teach the lottery gaming device, central lottery computer or wide area network controller recited in new independent claims 36 and 41. Acres does not disclose, teach or suggest the specific lottery gaming device recited in new independent claims 36 and 41. Furthermore, Acres does not disclose, teach or suggest the central lottery computer and wide area network controller recited in new independent claim 36 and 41. Acres discloses a network that links a plurality of gaming machines or devices located within a single casino. The Acres system utilizes an Ethernet network. Acres does not teach or suggest linking a casino central computer to a remote central lottery computer.

Therefore, the combination of Vancura and Acres does not teach or suggest the claimed networked gaming system. The combination of the teachings of Vancura and Acres is insufficient to enable one of skill in the art to arrive at the

networked gaming system recited in claims 36 and 41. Thus, it is not possible for one of ordinary skill in the art, having Vancura and Acres before him, to arrive at the claimed invention.

It is submitted in view of these amendments and remarks that all grounds for rejection have been removed.

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are therefore earnestly solicited. No additional fees are due for the new claims.

Respectfully submitted,

June 17, 2003

By:



Raymond A. Nuzzo
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 37,199